

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JACOB ANGELO MASSEY,

Case No.: 2:24-cv-01818-APG-BNW

Plaintiff

Order

v.

CHARLES DANIELS,

Defendant

Plaintiff Jacob Angelo Massey brings this civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to redress constitutional violations that he claims he suffered while incarcerated at Northern Nevada Correctional Center and Southern Desert Correctional Center. ECF No. 1. On January 10, 2025, the magistrate judge ordered Massey to update his address by February 10, 2025. ECF No. 9. That deadline expired without an updated address from Massey, and his mail from the court is being returned as undeliverable. *See* ECF No. 10.

I. Discussion

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a party’s failure to obey a court order or comply with local rules. *See Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order). In determining whether to dismiss an action on one of these grounds, I must consider: (1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its

1 docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of
2 cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives. *See In re*
3 *Phenylpropanolamine Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Malone*,
4 833 F.2d at 130).

5 The first two factors, the public’s interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation and the
6 court’s interest in managing its docket, weigh in favor of dismissal of Massey’s claims. The
7 third factor, risk of prejudice to defendants, also weighs in favor of dismissal because a
8 presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading
9 ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. *See Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th
10 Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits—is
11 greatly outweighed by the factors favoring dismissal.

12 The fifth factor requires me to consider whether less drastic alternatives can be used to
13 correct the party’s failure that brought about the court’s need to consider dismissal. *See Yourish*
14 *v. Cal. Amplifier*, 191 F.3d 983, 992 (9th Cir. 1999) (explaining that considering less drastic
15 alternatives *before* the party has disobeyed a court order does not satisfy this factor); *accord*
16 *Pagtalunan v. Galaza*, 291 F.3d 639, 643 & n.4 (9th Cir. 2002) (explaining that “the persuasive
17 force of” earlier Ninth Circuit cases that “implicitly accepted pursuit of less drastic alternatives
18 prior to disobedience of the court’s order as satisfying this element[,]” *i.e.*, like the “initial
19 granting of leave to amend coupled with the warning of dismissal for failure to comply[,]” have
20 been “eroded” by *Yourish*). Courts “need not exhaust every sanction short of dismissal before
21 finally dismissing a case, but must explore possible and meaningful alternatives.” *Henderson v.*
22 *Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986). Because this action cannot realistically proceed
23 without the ability for the court and the defendants to send Massey case-related documents,


1 filings, and orders, the only alternative is to enter a second order setting another deadline. But
2 without an updated address, the likelihood that the second order would even reach Massey is
3 low, so issuing a second order will only delay the inevitable and further squander the court's
4 finite resources. Setting another deadline is not a meaningful alternative given these
5 circumstances. So the fifth factor favors dismissal.

6 **II. Conclusion**

7 Having thoroughly considered these dismissal factors, I find that they weigh in favor of
8 dismissal. I THEREFORE ORDER that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
9 Massey's failure to file an updated address in compliance with this court's January 10, 2025,
10 order. The Clerk of Court is kindly requested to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.
11 No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case. If Massey wishes to pursue his
12 claims, he must file a complaint in a new case and provide the court with his current address.

13 I FURTHER ORDER that Massey's applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF
14 Nos. 4, 6) are DENIED as moot.

15
16 Dated: February 20, 2025

17 
18 _____
19 Chief United States District Judge
20
21
22
23